

Level 3 Screening Matrix

Level 3 Evaluation Criteria		N/A	1		3	16
		No Action	US 6 Improved Two Through Lanes Option A - Traffic Signals      Option B - Roundabouts		US 6 Four Through Lanes	Front Street Connection Two-Way with
Improve Corridor and Intersection Operations	Intersection 2040 Peak Hour Level of Service (LOS) and Delay (sec/veh) (AM / PM)	US 6C/I-70B: E (69) / E (59) US 6C/1st St: E (59) / F (86) US 6C/5th St: F (65) / F (92) US 6C/33 Rd: B (15) / B (18) I-70B/32 Rd: D (45) / E (59) I-70B/Old 32 Rd: A (8) / B (17)	US 6C/I-70B: D (44) / D (45) US 6C/1st St: B (18) / B (16) US 6C/5th St: A (6) / A (10) US 6C/33 Rd: B (17) / B (13) I-70B/32 Rd: D (39) / D (44) I-70B/Old 32 Rd: C (21) / B (11)	US 6C/I-70B: D (43) / D (48) US 6C/1st St: C (17) / C (19) US 6C/5th St: E (42) / F (63) US 6C/33 Rd: B (15) / B (19) I-70B/32 Rd: D (35) / D (45) I-70B/Old 32 Rd: C (23) / B (11)	US 6C/I-70B: D (37) / D (44) US 6C/1st St: B (15) / B (16) US 6C/5th St: B (14) / A (4) US 6C/33 Rd: B (13) / C (23) I-70B/32 Rd: D (41) / D (51) I-70B/Old 32 Rd: A (7) / B (11)	US 6C/I-70B: D (47) / D (52) US 6C/1st St: C (28) / D (44) US 6C/5th St: A (6) / A (8) US 6C/33 Rd: B (17) / C (21) I-70B/32 Rd: D (49) / D (43) I-70B/Old 32 Rd: B (15) / C (29)
	Peak Hour Queue Lengths (ft) (AM / PM)	WB US 6C at I-70B: 415 / 410 WB US 6C at 1st St: 540 / 470 EB US 6C at 1st St: 255 / 830 EB I-70B at US 6C: 520 / 260 WB I-70B at US 6C: 215 / 1250	WB US 6C at I-70B: 340 / 300 WB US 6C at 1st St: 150 / 145 EB US 6C at 1st St: 175 / 315 EB I-70B at US 6C: 465 / 240 WB I-70B at US 6C: 300 / 730	WB US 6C at I-70B: 295 / 305 WB US 6C at 1st St: 120 / 125 EB US 6C at 1st St: 205 / 505 EB I-70B at US 6C: 445 / 370 WB I-70B at US 6C: 250 / 980	WB US 6C at I-70B: 325 / 215 WB US 6C at 1st St: 205 / 155 EB US 6C at 1st St: 250 / 380 EB I-70B at US 6C: 375 / 360 WB I-70B at US 6C: 255 / 1340	WB US 6C at I-70B: 275 / 260 WB US 6C at 1st St: 500 / 605 EB US 6C at 1st St: 360 / 745 EB I-70B at US 6C: 385 / 440 WB I-70B at US 6C: 285 / 970
	Corridor Travel Time (AM / PM)	EB US 6C: 1.6 min / 2.6 min WB US 6C: 1.5 min / 2.2 min EB I-70B: 3.2 min / 3.3 min WB I-70B: 2.6 min / 4.1 min	EB US 6C: 1.6 min / 3.1 min WB US 6C: 1.4 min / 2.1 min EB I-70B: 2.9 min / 2.9 min WB I-70B: 2.6 min / 3.1 min	EB US 6C: 1.6 min / 2.5 min WB US 6C: 1.5 min / 1.4 min EB I-70B: 3.6 min / 3.1 min WB I-70B: 2.8 min / 3.5 min	EB US 6C: 1.6 min / 2.1 min WB US 6C: 1.3 min / 1.3 min EB I-70B: 2.7 min / 3.3 min WB I-70B: 2.5 min / 4.0 min	EB US 6C: 1.7 min / 2.2 min WB US 6C: 1.6 min / 1.5 min EB I-70B: 2.6 min / 3.0 min WB I-70B: 2.5 min / 3.3 min
	Daily 2040 Traffic Volumes (veh/day) and Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (v/c)	US 6C (east of 1st St): 22,000 veh/day (1.38) Front St: 500 veh/day (0.03) I-70: 45,500 veh/day (0.70) I-70B (south of US 6C): 34,000 veh/day (0.80) E 1/2 Rd (east of 32 Rd): 5,200 veh/day (0.33) 32 Rd (south of I-70B): 25,000 veh/day (0.71)	US 6C (east of 1st St): 22,000 veh/day (1.00) Front St: 500 veh/day (0.03) I-70: 45,500 veh/day (0.70) I-70B (south of US 6C): 34,000 veh/day (0.80) E 1/2 Rd (east of 32 Rd): 5,200 veh/day (0.33) 32 Rd (south of I-70B): 25,000 veh/day (0.71)	US 6C (east of 1st St): 22,000 veh/day (1.00) Front St: 500 veh/day (0.03) I-70: 45,500 veh/day (0.70) I-70B (south of US 6C): 34,000 veh/day (0.80) E 1/2 Rd (east of 32 Rd): 5,200 veh/day (0.33) 32 Rd (south of I-70B): 25,000 veh/day (0.71)	US 6C (east of 1st St): 27,800 veh/day (0.79) Front St: 400 veh/day (0.03) I-70: 44,400 veh/day (0.68) I-70B (south of US 6C): 36,500 veh/day (0.86) E 1/2 Rd (east of 32 Rd): 2,400 veh/day (0.15) 32 Rd (south of I-70B): 26,600 veh/day (0.76)	US 6C (east of 1st St): 20,000 veh/day (0.91) Front St: 600 veh/day (0.38) I-70: 45,100 veh/day (0.69) I-70B (south of US 6C): 31,500 veh/day (0.74) E 1/2 Rd (east of 32 Rd): 3,100 veh/day (0.19) 32 Rd (south of I-70B): 24,400 veh/day (0.70)
	Consistency with the US 6 - Clifton Access Control Plan	Maintaining all existing accesses is not consistent with Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions, but reduced access for Lois and Holland Street is not consistent with Access Control Plan.	Four lanes, median treatments, and increased access control as assumed in Access Control Plan.	Increased access control and turn restrictions consistent with Access Control Plan.
Enhance Multimodal Connectivity	Missing Sidewalk/Path Links & Out-of-Direction Travel	Missing sidewalks, narrow sidewalks, and lack of bicycle facilities along US 6C do not accommodate pedestrian/bicyclist activity. Pedestrian/bicyclist crossings in downtown over 1/4 mile apart.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C.		Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of four vehicular lanes would accommodate pedestrians/bicyclists, but may not encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments of two vehicular lanes would accommodate and may encourage pedestrian/bicyclist activity along US 6C and along Front St.
	Accommodation of Travel Mode Interconnectivity (Pedestrian, Bicycle, Automobile, Transit)	Existing sidewalk facilities do not meet ADA standards, making it difficult to access bus stops. Lack of sidewalk and bicycle facilities does not provide adequate connections between modes.	Sidewalk and bicycle facilities provide connections between modes. Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times.		Sidewalk and bicycle facilities provide connections between modes. Bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership. Vehicular operational benefits would allow for faster transit travel times. Traffic could pass buses stopped in right lane.	Sidewalk and bicycle facilities provide connections between modes and bus stop amenities may help attract transit ridership, including along Front St. Bus stop amenities along Front St would require UPRR coordination. Front St connection may allow for faster transit travel times.
Improve Traveler Safety	Reduction in Unsafe Physical and Operational Conditions along US 6C	No changes to existing roadside hazards, lack of access control, and operational conditions.	Improvements address operational and safety issues associated with congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements with improved roadside clearance and delineation of pedestrian/bicyclist movements.	Improvements address operational and safety issues associated with congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements and roundabouts would reduce corridor speeds and may reduce injury crashes.	Improvements address operational and safety issues associated with congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements with improved roadside clearance and delineation of pedestrian/bicyclist movements.	Improvements along US 6C address operational and safety issues associated with congestion and lack of access control. Roadway reconstruction provides safety improvements, but new safety concerns introduced with added volume along Front St.
	User Perception of Comfort and Safety of Pedestrian and Bicycle Movements	Increasingly uncomfortable for pedestrians and bicyclists with increased congestion, lack of sidewalk or bicycle facilities, numerous open driveway crossings, and proximity to congested travel lanes.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments and access control increases pedestrian and bicyclist comfort and improves driver expectancy for crossing movements.		Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments and access control increases pedestrian and bicyclist comfort, but crossing distance of US 6C increased with four vehicular lanes.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities with crossing treatments and access control increases pedestrian and bicyclist comfort and improves driver expectancy for crossing movements.
	Reduction in Multimodal Conflict Points	Missing sidewalks, no bicycle facilities, and lack of access control along US 6C force pedestrians and bicyclists close to traffic.	Designated space for pedestrians/bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control substantially reduces conflict points.	Designated space for pedestrians/bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control substantially reduces conflict points. Roundabouts would reduce vehicular turning conflicts.	Designated space for pedestrians/bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points, but pedestrians/bicyclists must cross four vehicular lanes.	Designated space for pedestrians/bicyclists along with crossing treatments and increased access control reduces conflict points along existing US 6C alignment, but some additional conflicts with added traffic along Front St.
Avoid and Minimize Environmental Impacts	Potentially Impacted Cultural Resources	No impacts	Potential minor impact to NRHP site (church) along US 6C.		Potential minor impact to NRHP site (church) along US 6C.	Potential minor impact to NRHP site (church) along US 6C and Old 32 Road alignment (historic highway).
	Potentially Impacted Noise Receivers	No impacts	Potential for minor impacts to church along US 6C.	Potential for minor impacts to church along US 6C and moderate impacts to Clifton Elementary School.	Potential for minor impacts to church along US 6C and moderate impacts to Clifton Elementary School.	Potential for minor impacts to church along US 6C and Clifton Elementary School and minor impacts to church along 5th Street with additional traffic and widening along Front Street.
	Potentially Impacted Hazardous Material Sites	No impacts	Potential for minor impacts to hazardous material sites.		Potential for moderate impacts to hazardous material site.	Potential for minor impacts to hazardous material sites.
Avoid and Minimize Community Impacts	Right-of-Way Required (acres)	None	Full = None Partial = 1.2 ac	Full = 1.0 ac (1 res; 2 bus; 1 comm) Partial = 1.0 ac	Full = 2.9 ac (2 res; 14 bus; 1 comm) Partial = 1.7 ac	Full = 2.2 ac (8 res; 2 bus) Partial = 3.0 ac
	Right-of-Way Required (properties)	None	Residential = 8 Business = 24 Public/Community = 5	Residential = 8 Business = 24 Public/Community = 5	Residential = 8 Business = 21 Public/Community = 4	Residential = 26 Business = 32 Public/Community = 8
	Property Impacts for Partial Acquisitions	No impacts	Moderate parking and circulation impacts for properties along US 6C.		Major parking and circulation impacts for properties along US 6C.	Moderate parking and circulation impacts for properties along US 6C and Front St.
	Increase in Traffic Traveling through Clifton Neighborhood	No changes in local street circulation and no expected increase in US 6C traffic volume traveling on local streets.	Some changes in local street circulation with turn restrictions at some accesses along US 6C.		Some changes in local street circulation with turn restrictions at some accesses along US 6C.	Some changes in circulation with US 6C turn restrictions, as well as potential for moderate increase in traffic volume on local streets south of US 6C with new Front St connection.
	Consistency with Established Local and Regional Plans	No improvements to US 6C corridor is not consistent with previous local and regional planning efforts.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, access control, and improved traffic operations along US 6C generally support local and regional transportation and community plans.		Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, access control, and improved traffic operations along US 6C generally support local and regional transportation and community plans.	Pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and access control along US 6C support local and regional transportation and community plans, but traffic volumes along Front St are not consistent with previous planning efforts.
Maximize Implementability	Use of Existing Infrastructure	Aging roadway infrastructure utilized without reconstruction, but increasing maintenance needs.	Roadway and multimodal improvements accomplished largely within existing roadway envelope with utilities and pavement reconstruction.	Roadway and multimodal improvements accomplished largely within existing roadway envelope, except at roundabouts and removal of traffic signal at 1st St.	Roadway and multimodal improvements require substantial widening and utilities reconstruction.	Roadway and multimodal improvements along US 6C accomplished largely within existing roadway envelope with utilities and pavement reconstruction. Improvements along Front St require substantial widening. New 32 Rd underpass adds major infrastructure.
	Conceptual-level Probable Construction Costs (does not include ROW cost) (low, moderate, high)	Low No construction cost	Moderate \$6 - 8 Million	Moderate \$8 - 10 Million	Moderate \$8 - 10 Million	High US 6: \$6 - 8 Million Front St: \$10 - 12 Million Total: \$16 - 20 Million
	Ease and Cost of Maintenance (low, moderate, high)	Moderate Aging roadway infrastructure with congestion creating access constraints.	Low Typical roadway maintenance with new reconstruction.	Low Typical roadway maintenance and removal of signal.	Moderate Typical roadway maintenance with increased lane-miles for added lanes.	High Increase in maintenance with additional structure maintenance for 32 Rd underpass.
	Ability to Fund/Implement with Separate Projects	N/A	Opportunity for improvements to be constructed and opened separately as fundable projects as sections along US 6C. Projects located along existing state highway system.		Opportunity for improvements to be constructed and opened separately as fundable projects as sections along US 6C. Projects located along existing state highway system.	Opportunity for US 6C and Front St reconstruction and bridge to be constructed and opened separately in sections as fundable projects. Front St would remain local roadway and Front St improvements would be implemented by Mesa County.
<b>DRAFT RECOMMENDATION</b>		<b>CARRIED FORWARD</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>NOT RECOMMENDED</b>
<b>NOTES</b>		Further analysis required as the No Action Alternative in NEPA process for comparison to improvement alternatives.	This alternative is recommended for consideration as the Recommended Alternative in NEPA process because the alternative provides reasonable safety and multimodal mobility benefits related to congestion and lack of access control, while minimizing impacts to the community and environmental and cultural resources.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the alternative would result in substantially more full property acquisitions, higher cost, and worse intersection levels of service than Alternative 1 Option A.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the alternative would result in comparably higher property impacts without better traffic operations, safety, and multimodal mobility benefits for the US 6C corridor than other alternatives.	This alternative is not recommended for further consideration because the alternative would result in comparably higher property impacts and cost without better traffic operations, safety, and multimodal mobility benefits for the US 6C corridor than other alternatives.

GREEN = Comparatively beneficial and/or minor impacts  
 BLACK = Comparatively neutral benefits and/or moderate impacts  
 RED = Comparatively minor or no benefits and/or major impacts